



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,979	06/29/2001	Rajeeta Lalji Shah	AUS920010501US1	9262

7590 04/13/2005

Duck W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

TRUONG, CAMQUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/895,979	SHAH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Camquy Truong	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.
2. It is noted that although the present application does contain line numbers in the specification and claims, the line numbers in the claims do not correspond to the preferred format. The preferred format is to number each line of every claim, with each claim beginning with line 1. For ease of reference by both the examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

- i. As to claims 1, 11 and 21, lines 4-5, it is not clearly understood how "set of related events" relates to a task (i.e. a task has a plurality of events?); line 6, it is not clearly indicated whether "the event" refers to "set of related events" in line 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,470,388 B1) in view of Teng et al (U.S. Patent 6,094,679).

6. As to claims 1, 11 and 21, Niemi teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: A method for tracking in logging system (col. 3, lines 63-66), the method comprising:

Receiving, at log task manager (logging service layer, col. 4, line 13), a request associated with an application program to assign a unique task identification to a set of related events having a relationship with a task identified by application program to be tracked, wherein the relationship between the events and the task is established by the application program (col. 4, lines 11-14; col. 6, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 11-18; col. 10, lines 19-24; col. 16, lines 17-21 and lines 27-31);

Generating, at a log task manager, the unique task identification (col. 10, lines 19-24);

Combining the unique task identification with logging information generated by one or more of the components to correlate logging information entries associated with related events (col. 4, lines 29-32; col. 11, line 66-col. 12, line 15); and

Filtering a plurality of logging information entries based on the unique task identification to produce a set of correlated logging information entries associated with the related events for presentation to a user (Fig. 5; Fig. 6; col. 13, lines 16-40; col. 58-67).

7. Niemi does not explicitly teach that attaching the unique task identification to a transport mechanism that passes information between components. However, Teng teaches an data field which provides the network server with information about the network client may be appended to HTTP formatted request message before issued to the network server (col.7, lines 36-40).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that to combine the teaching of Niemi and Teng because Teng's attaching the unique task identification to a transport mechanism that passes information between components would increase the flexibility of Niemi by providing attaching the unique task identification to a transport mechanism that passes information between components to minimize the risk that the network server return software files which are mismatched.

9. As to claims 2 and 12, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 11 and 21.

10. As to claim 4, Niemi teaches the transport mechanism utilizes a remote proxy call (col. 9, lines 20-21).

11. As to claims 5 and 15, Niemi teaches the transport mechanism utilizes a port hardware (col. 9, lines 49-50).

12. As to claims 6 - 7, 14 and 16 - 17, Niemi does not explicitly teach a point-to-point protocol and hypertext transfer protocol. However, it is well known to those skilled in the art, that is a point-to-point protocol and hypertext transfer protocols are needed for communication between components. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a point-to-point protocol and hypertext transfer protocol because they would allow computers to be connected in network environment for exchanging information.

13. As to claims 8 and 18, Niemi teaches the transport mechanism utilizes a message context (col. 12, lines 30-36).

14. As to claims 9 and 19, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 11 and 21. In addition, Niemi teaches receiving, at the log task manager, a request from the application program for a second unique task identification assigned to second related serial events identified by the application (col. 4, lines 11-14; col. 6, lines 3-8; col. 8, lines 11-18; col. 10, lines 19-24 and lines 49-57; col. 16, lines 17-21 and lines 27-31).

15. As to claims 10, 20 and 22, Niemi teaches mapping a taskID to a corresponding action, wherein the corresponding action provides a user friendly description of the related events (col. 4, lines 29-32; col. 11, line 66-col. 12, line 15); and

presenting logging information to a user based on the corresponding action (Fig. 5; Fig. 6; col. 13, lines 16-40; col. 58-67).

16. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Niemi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,470,388 B1) in view of Teng (U.S. Patent 6,094,679), as applied as claims 1, 11 and 21 above, and further in view of Block (U.S. 6,820,261 B1).

17. As to claim 3 and 13, Teng teaches at the local thread transport, placing the task identification on a local thread (col.7, lines 36-40).

18. Niemi and Teng do not teach the inheritable thread local. However, Block teaches the inheritable thread local (2, lines 11-18).

19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Niemi, Teng and Block because Block's extending the inheritable thread local would increase the flexibility of Niemi and Teng's system by providing inheritable thread local to provide automatic value inheritance upon child creation.

Response to the argument

20. Applicant's arguments filed 1/13/2005 for claims 1-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Camquy Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 8888. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

Camquy Truong

April 1, 2005


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100